

Appl. No. 09/872,645
Docket No: 17400US02
Resp. dtd. Dec. 7, 2006
Reply to Office action of Aug. 16, 2006

Amendments to the Drawings:

The original drawings for this application were approved as filed. The Applicant, however, has determined that a clean set of drawings with freehand writing replaced would enhance the readability of the present application. Accordingly, the Applicant has submitted a new set of official drawings with this response. The Applicant submits that no new matter has been added to the submitted replacement drawings and requests that the set of replacement drawings be substituted for the original set of drawings.

Appl. No. 09/872,645
Docket No: 17400US02
Resp. dtd. Dec. 7, 2006
Reply to Office action of Aug. 16, 2006

REMARKS

Claims 4, 13, 22, 28-30, 34, 40-42, 45, 52 and 58-96 were pending in the present application at the time of the Office Action, to which new claims 97-112 have been added.

Claims 4, 13, 22, 34, 45, 52 and 58-92 stand allowed.

Claims 28, 40, 93, 95 and 96 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 6,772,391 to Shin ("*Shin*") in view of United States Patent No. 6,987,543 to Mogre et al. ("*Mogre*").

Claims 29-30 and 41-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Shin* in view of *Mogre* and in view of admitted prior art.

Claim 94 stands objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

For at least the reasons stated below, the Applicant respectfully traverses the above rejections and objections.

Turning first to the rejection of claims 28-30, 40-42, 95 and 96, such claims have been canceled by the present amendment.

Turning next to the rejection of independent claim 93 and objection to dependent claim 94, the Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. The Office Action states that dependent claim 94 would be allowable if written in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim (*i.e.*, independent claim 93) and any intervening claims (of which there were none). Accordingly, independent claim 93 has been amended to state dependent claim 94 in independent form, and claim 94 has been canceled. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that claim 93, as currently amended, is allowable.

Turning next to new claims 97-101, such claims each depend from independent claim 59, which the Office Action stated is allowable. Additionally, new dependent claims 97-101 add details generally analogous to details already examined in dependent claims 63-68. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that new claims 97-101 are in condition for allowance.

Turning next to new claims 102-106, such claims each depend from independent claim 61, which the Office Action stated is allowable. Additionally, new dependent claims 102-106

Appl. No. 09/872,645
Docket No: 17400US02
Resp. dtd. Dec. 7, 2006
Reply to Office action of Aug. 16, 2006

add details generally analogous to details already examined in dependent claims 63-68. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that new claims 102-106 are in condition for allowance.

Turning next to new claims 107-112, such claims each depend from independent claim 93, which the Office Action stated is allowable. Additionally, new dependent claims 107-112 add details generally analogous to details already examined in dependent claims 63-68. Accordingly, the Applicant submits that new claims 107-112 are in condition for allowance.

The Office Action includes various statements concerning former claims 28-30, 40-42, 93, 95 and 96 and various references, which are moot in light of the above amendments and comments. Accordingly, the present response does not address such statements. The Applicant neither agrees nor disagrees with such statements and expressly reserves the right to challenge such statements in the future should the need arise.

Based on at least the foregoing, the Applicant believes that claims 4, 13, 22, 34, 45, 52, 58-93 and 97-112 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Applicant courteously solicits a Notice of Allowability with respect to all pending claims. If the Examiner disagrees or has questions regarding this submission, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner telephone the undersigned at 312-775-8000.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge additional fee(s) or credit overpayment(s) to the deposit account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Account No. 13-0017.

Dated: Dec. 7, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

/Shawn L. Peterson/
Shawn L. Peterson
Attorney for applicant
Reg. No. 44,286

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 West Madison Street
Chicago, Illinois 60661
Telephone: (312) 775-8000